

Appl. No. 10/511,079
Amdt. Dated May 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of November 8, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In regard to the section 112 rejection of claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 1 to remove the language found by the Examiner to be objectionable. Applicant submits that the amended claim language fully comports with all of the requirements of section 112. Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC section 112. Applicant has also modified Figure 8 in accordance with the Examiner's request.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 USC. sections 102 and 103.. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicant's presently claimed invention.

More specifically, Applicant notes that the present invention is directed to an improved technique for achieving more precise photolithographic geometries by reducing and/or eliminating errors arising out of the optical proximity effect and which specifically addresses the phenomenon involving the relationship between increasing line density and greater mask errors. Applicant respectfully submits that none of the references of record and specifically those relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims

Appl. No. 10/511,079
Amdt. Dated May 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of November 8, 2007

provides any teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding this advance in the art.

Applicant has modified the claims for the purpose of highlighting the above-referenced distinctions between the present invention and the prior art references cited by the Examiner. More specifically, by this amendment, Applicant has modified the claims to require:

selectively setting an exposing condition to alter at least one of a numerical aperture (NA) and a coherence factor (σ) of an exposing device depending upon a pattern pitch of a region where ~~when~~ said corrected mask is transferred.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the references cited by the Examiner provides any teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding the selective setting of an exposing condition depending upon the pattern pitch of a mask region that is being transferred. Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/511,079
Amdt. Dated May 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of November 8, 2007

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due or to
credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3891.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/4/08

(Reg. #37-607)

Robert J. Depke
ROCKEY, DEPKE & LYONS, LLC
Sears Tower, Suite 5450
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6306
Tel: (312) 277-2006
Attorneys for Applicant

Appl. No. 10/511,079
Amdt. Dated May 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of November 8, 2007

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

In Fig. 8, please add the legend "PRIOR ART" as requested by the

Examiner.

In Fig. 8, box S3, please change the text to read as "MEASURE
DIMENSION ON TRANSFER WAFER". Applicants submit that no new
matter has been added.